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Peace movements in many different forms and degrees have been present throughout history. But advocacy of peace studies in educational institutions is quite a recent phenomenon. While a few groups have advocated peace studies since the 1950s, a preponderance of curricular materials and literature did not appear until the 1980s (Scott, 1984).

In the early 1970s, only a handful of people were capable of representing all groups which were organized at that time for the purpose of studying war and peace (New York Friends Group, Inc., 1971). The 1980s, however, appear to be the beginning of widespread interest in such studies. Scott's interpretation of the differences in questionnaire responses (regarding peace studies programs) between 1979 and 1983 seemed to confirm that the movement has grown larger and more serious (Scott, 1984).

Given the current proliferation of peace studies curricula and resource materials literature, and conferences, it seems logical to assume that there are societal factors
contributing to the growth (Winter, 1986). Some possible causes are alluded to in much of the literature by way of rationales for addressing related issues in schools (Mayrand, 1983). There seems, however, to have been no attempt made to synthesize such sources into a comprehensive listing that could establish a pattern. There has also been no attempt to systematically link the growth of peace studies with historical events which may have precipitated this increased interest.

Statement of the Problem

Given the gaps in the rationales stated in the literature, the purpose of this paper was to address the following questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the growth of peace studies and societal influences such as historical or political developments and trends, economics, or other societal and educational trends?
2. Are organizational factors influencing the rate of growth of the movement? For example, is the trend a result of a centralized, top-down approach, or more of a grassroots, bottom-up phenomenon?

This study is an attempt to analyze and synthesize sources which point to possible reasons for the surge in peace studies. Areas which were investigated include surveys of public opinion, historical events, educational history and trends, and research on personality development as it relates to issues of war and peace.

Significance of the Study

A review of current literature does not reveal an adequate synthesis of factors contributing to the interest in peace education. Information on this topic is important in that it can lead to an understanding of the dynamics that influence other areas of education.

An analysis of factors contributing to the current shift in thinking regarding peace education could shed light on how teachers come to
an understanding of issues. It could increase understanding about the length of time needed for widespread changes to occur in educational institutions.

It is impossible to prove or refute a position regarding whether public education reinforces or alters social structures. Historical studies of educational trends, however, can contribute to an understanding of societal expectations for public education.

Definition of the Term "Peace Studies"

Carlson (1984) noted that peace education has been described as having a number of dimensions: farther reaches, global education, futuristics, interdependence and global problems, human rights, development, conflict resolution, decision making, demographic studies, and environmental studies. Another large dimension is the study of present nuclear technology (Fleming, 1984; National PTA, 1985). This broad, interdisciplinary view is contrasted to previous attempts to focus either on law and conflict resolution or on trade and
development (Scott, 1984). For the purpose of this study, the most broad definition of peace studies is used. (Definitions of technical terms are listed in the appendix.)
Review of Related Literature

Current Status and Trends in Peace Education

Peace education is in an evolutionary process. Though it has existed in many forms throughout history, it has recently changed in two major ways: in numbers of programs and materials, and in breadth of focus.

Growth in numbers of programs and materials.
Scott (1984) traced the beginnings of peace research to the late fifties and early sixties. He cited as evidence the establishment of professional journals (in 1957 and 1959), university departments, and international associations (in 1963-1964) which were devoted to such studies. In 1965, there were approximately 100 institutions in the world which dedicated at least some of their efforts to peace research; by 1978 there were 310 such institutions. The increased attention at the university level was apparent from responses to questionnaires sent
prior to compilation. In 1979, the researchers received responses from 400 of 7,500 questionnaire recipients. In 1983, they received more responses than they had actually solicited: twelve thousand were received, even though only ten thousand had been mailed (Scott, 1984).

Nesbitt noted in 1971 that the five educators at a roundtable discussion were capable of representing nearly all of the groups which were working at that time toward peace education (New York Friends Group, Inc., 1971). In 1984, however, there were over 1450 groups in the United States alone which were involved in the peace movement. Of the 1450+ groups, 34 were described as dealing directly with peace education at the elementary through college levels (Fine & Steven, 1984). There were also 181 national organizations. Sixty-nine peace related educational programs were identified at the college and university levels; these included only institutions with majors, minors, or well-defined concentration areas, not those offering only one or two isolated courses dealing with peace and
war. There were 417 local groups which were limited to particular geographical regions. In addition, 767 local chapters and independent groups were affiliated with national organizations. These groups do not represent an exhaustive listing as the literature suggests others, both local and national, which may not have been identified.

Further strong evidence of massive growth of the movement is provided by the proliferation of related curricular materials and literature. Winter (1986) stated that the numbers of advocacy articles, books, pamphlets, curricula, audiovisual, and other related materials have been growing at an astounding rate for the last five years. As a specific example, she cited the associate director of Educators for Social Responsibility, who, in 1985, received 15 works per week related to the cause per week.

Isolated articles are found in many educational journals, but the issue of peace education is considered important and timely
enough to have been the sole focus of special issues in the 1980s of such journals as *Teachers College Record, Harvard Educational Review*, and *History and Social Science Teacher*. A fairly narrow ERIC computer search done in March, 1986 revealed many sources, most of which were written in 1982 or later.

**Changes in focus of current peace studies.**

In addition to growth in numbers of programs, Scott outlined changes in emphasis of peace studies. When the field was in its infancy, the focus was disarmament, formal considerations of law and conflict resolutions, and trade and development as answers to international tensions. More recently, however, these topics have been incorporated into a more interdisciplinary, holistic, group process-oriented approach. There has been criticism concerning fragmentation in the social sciences as universities have moved toward specialization. It is the aim of current peace studies to move away from this specialization (Scott, 1984).
Carlson (1984) outlined the diversity in and the interdisciplinary dimensions of various peace study programs. Among these are: (a) farther reaches—including spiritual dimensions, right brain development, and transcendental and holistic education; (b) futuristics and global education—including such topics as the United Nations, world order, and world citizenship; (c) interdependence and global problems—including environmental issues; (d) peace—including conflict resolution, aggression, disarmament, non-violence, human rights and social justice; (e) development—including use and distribution of resources and world trade; (f) decision making—including governance structures, political process, and policy-making; and (g) population—including demographic concerns. Other terms mentioned in the article are attitude, crises, education, economics, liberation, protest, security, and warfare. Still two other dimensions are noted: those related to structures of society, and those related to structures of individual consciousness. The vast number of
these topics, accompanied by many subtopics, illustrates the diversity of the current peace education movement.

To aid in understanding the unwieldy array of curricula, Carlson (1984) has separated them into categories. The materials were placed into these three groups: (a) those dealing with peace and disarmament in the context of an interdependent world; (b) those focusing on conflict resolution; and (c) those relating to basic factual information (e.g., nuclear stockpiles and studies of outcomes of past wars).
Possible Reasons for Growth in Peace Education

A perusal of current materials dealing with war and peace issues reveals that of all of the types of warfare discussed, the major area of concern is nuclear warfare. The technological capability for such warfare has been apparent since 1945, but heightened, vocal, and widespread concern did not become prevalent until approximately 35 years after the only hostile use of this technology. This grassroots concern is manifested in various protest marches and election referenda, conferences, and casual conversations. In addition it is being reflected in the more formal sources of information outlined by Scott (1984). It may be assumed that there is a variety of factors contributing to this relatively recent concern. The following five sections will address some possible factors: (a) Historical and Political Factors; (b) Technological Factors; (c) Social Factors; (d) Educational Trends; and (e) Psychological Research. The distinction among these categories is at times artificial; actually,
all are interrelated, and contribute to the other categories.

**Historical and Political Factors**

Many historical and political factors could be given partial credit for the rapid, recent growth of the peace movement and peace studies. Among them are: nuclear weapons policies, nuclear weapons proliferation, and unsuccessful attempts at arms control.

**Nuclear weapons policies.**

According to Wieseltier, the peace movement of the 1980s began in western Europe and spread to the United States. He named a 1979 NATO decision to install in Europe medium-range nuclear missiles (the Pershing II and the cruise missile) as the cause of European agitation. This decision to deploy was viewed as lowering the nuclear threshold (i.e., making nuclear war more likely). These weapons were smaller and so were perceived as being more likely to be used (Wieseltier, 1983).
In addition to its spreading from western Europe, Wieseltier (1983) felt there was another reason for the peace movement's growth in the United States. He linked it to the view of the world held by the then-new President, Ronald Reagan, who spoke of controlling nuclear war rather than of controlling arms.

A frequently mentioned cause of great concern was a publicized change in U.S. policy. In 1982, the New York Times leaked information on the 1984-1986 defense guidance plan of the Reagan administration (Halloran, 1982). The plan signaled a shift away from the previous mutual assured destruction (MAD) policy, in which deterrence of first use was to be achieved through fear of mutual annihilation. Instead, the newer policy considered a winnable, possibly protracted yet limited, nuclear war with the Soviet Union. This is accompanied by a greater enthusiasm for both civil defense and anti-ballistic missile systems.

Among the criticisms evoked by this shift in policy is the judgment offered by Lieutenant
General Scowcroft, as cited by Paine (1982). The type of controlled nuclear warfare envisioned by the administration presents a contradiction. That is, it presumes communication with Soviet leaders in order to reach an agreement amenable to U. S. interests. Yet an efficient attack involves targeting leadership and command and control systems, thereby implying a loss of communications which would preclude negotiations.

Much concern has been voiced over the shift in policy away from deterrence based on mutual assured destruction. Meanwhile the debate on such deterrence still rages. Advocates maintain that it has worked, and offer as proof the fact that no nuclear weapons have been exploded as a hostile act since 1945. Detractors maintain, however, that deterrence has failed, and offer as evidence the acceleration of the arms race.

A lengthy discussion of the deterrence question was provided by Wieseltier (1983). He perceived deterrence as being criticized by both the ideological right and left wings. Among the thoughts generated in the debate by deterrence
detractors: (a) Deterrence is immoral, because mutual assured destruction is really mutually assured genocide; (b) Deterrence is based on faith in rationality of leaders; (c) Deterrence is said to have worked, but if it has worked in the past, there is no assurance that it will continue to work in the future. "Deterrence must be the only public arrangement that is a total failure if it is successful 99.9 percent of the time" (Wieseltier, 1983, p. 35). In response to such criticisms, he noted that they were well founded, but that the critics' alternatives to deterrence were not sufficient. His conclusion was that deterrence alone is not enough; it should not be rejected, but should be accompanied by disarmament (Wieseltier, 1983).

Previous threats by U.S. Presidents to use nuclear weapons have been revealed. Truman and Eisenhower threatened their use during the Korean Conflict. Truman's threat was public (Ferrell, 1980), while Eisenhower's was private (Eisenhower, 1963). Kennedy issued public threats during threatening events in Berlin and Cuba (Blechman
and Kaplan, 1978; Kennedy, 1971). Nixon repeatedly issued secret threats during the Vietnam Conflict (Haldeman, 1978). Haldeman alluded to Nixon's Madman Theory. Nixon felt he was in a position to make a nuclear threat because he had a long record of anti-Communist rhetoric. He urged his staff to lead the North Vietnamese to believe that he was obsessed with Communism and might do anything to stop the war. But as Haldeman recounted, the theory crumbled because the North Vietnamese knew the American public had turned against the war. It would, therefore, only be a matter of time before the U. S. would have to withdraw from Vietnam. This failure to bluff the North Vietnamese leaders could explain Nixon's attempts to suppress the anti-war movement.

Ellsberg (1981) further elaborated on United States nuclear policy, which he said has been based on first use capabilities ever since 1945. He went so far as to say that the first use option is such a strong consideration that most U. S. weapons are designed for that purpose, not for deterrence. No American president has pledged
to avoid first use, even "...though the Soviets have repeatedly proposed this as a bilateral commitment" (Ellsberg, 1981, p. 14). According to Ellsberg, the U. S. has always sought superiority at all levels of weaponry because of a belief in the importance of first strike capability.

**Nuclear weapons proliferation.**

Concerns are not limited to scenarios involving superpower use of nuclear weapons. Another major worry is the development of these weapons in other countries. According to a 1982 Ground Zero publication, six countries had nuclear weapons, and two others were believed to have them in spite of their denials. Ground Zero projected that by 1992, dozens more countries would have nuclear weapons. A growing fear is that a country with a mentally unstable leader will develop nuclear weapons. This further questions the faith in human rationality as a basis for deterrence. Such anxiety is exacerbated by the realization that nuclear weapons are engaged in trouble spots in the world, most notably in the Middle East. This suggests the probability of weapons being
used in regional conflicts and increases the chances of terrorists gaining access to materials needed to make such weapons. "The problem is the law of averages . . ." (Ground Zero, 1982, p. 221). Nations with nuclear weapons are viewed as wild cards, making a rational or orderly game impossible (Ground Zero, 1982).

It remains exceedingly difficult for the United States or the Soviet Union to maintain credibility when seeking to halt nuclear proliferation among non-nuclear nations. The vast buildup of nuclear stockpiles of the two superpowers does not inspire other nations to pursue a course of restraint.

The official reason stated for buildup and duplication was ability to destroy the Soviet Union even if one system of the Triad were to be made ineffective by attack. Dyer contended that the real reason is much less theoretical, and is rather a reflection of interservice rivalry. Admiral LaRocque, who has painted a picture of a ridiculous growth in each leg of the Triad, said
it"...has grown to such proportions that it has become the Holy Trinity" (Dyer, 1985, p. 215).

A similar rivalry exists among Soviet branches of the military, although the army has always been their dominant force. The most notable difference between the two countries' interservice rivalries lies in motives. A profit motive exists in the U.S. in contrast to military careerist motives in the Soviet Union (Dyer, 1985).

Unsuccessful attempts at arms control.

Considering the vast numbers of weapons, it might seem relatively easy to negotiate some arms reductions. One factor, however, complicates arms negotiations. The weapons under consideration do not quite equal weapons from the arsenals of the opposing side (Ground Zero, 1982).

Technological Factors

Changes in weapons technology also affect the public perception of nuclear war. The irony is that as weapons become more advanced, they decrease wait time. Mayrand (1983) noted that
Pershing II, Trident, and proposed MX missiles have the capability of reaching Soviet targets in six minutes, thus drastically reducing decision-making time. She also cited potential difficulties posed by more sophisticated, relatively small weapons such as cruise missiles. Such weapons are "...hard to monitor by a peacekeeping delegation, making it difficult to agree on any treaties that allow for deployment of the cruise" (Mayrand, 1983, p. 28).

There has been a reliance on launch-on-warning systems which rely on inanimate objects to take action, independent of human decision-making. Coupled with fear of system error, frequency of use of this technology is of great concern to people. In an 18-month period, North American Defense Command (NORAD) received 151 false alarms, four of which resulted increased states of alert of various nuclear forces. Component malfunctions caused two of these alarms, and one major false alert occurred when a technician inserted the wrong training tape (one
simulating Soviet attack) into an active defense computer system (Mayrand, 1983).

This raises another concern, that of human error. Many military personnel with access to nuclear weaponry are being removed each year from their positions because of drug/alcohol abuse or psychological disorders, along with negligence and contemptuous attitudes toward the law (Mayrand, 1983).

Submarine-launched missiles add to the instability. Submarines have been able to stay below the surface of the sea for at least sixty days, even as early as the mid-1950s. They are virtually undetectable, and their possible proximity to enemy territory reduces further the missile delivery or wait time. Earlier submarines, such as the Polaris, have been replaced by the Polaris/Poseidon models, and most recently by Tridents, which carry larger payloads and have longer ranges. The first Polaris missiles had a range of 1,500 miles, while the latest version had a range of 2,500 miles. The Trident range of 4,000 miles gives it the
capability to strike Soviet targets from nearly any ocean area in the northern hemisphere (Ground Zero, 1982).

The most recent debate is over the Reagan Administration's proposed Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI or "Star Wars"): Debate rages over its expense, morality, first-strike capability, and feasibility. According to Congressional Representative Leach (1985), SDI would be useful only as a bargaining chip. He noted that offensive weapons can be developed to knock out defensive weapons for much less money. He questioned the credibility of the Reagan administration's plan to share the technology with the Soviet Union. It would be difficult to justify sharing SDI after having spent one trillion dollars to develop it. According to some estimates, even if SDI were to become 99% effective, the Soviet Union could still detonate an average of four weapons per state. Each would be 30-50 times more powerful than the Hiroshima bomb. Effectiveness of 99% is about twice the projected maximum effectiveness of the SDI
program. Leach also noted that SDI could do nothing to protect citizens from cruise-type missiles or suitcase bombs (ones smuggled into the country or made by individuals), nor could it protect people from chemical or biological warfare.

Not only does the sophistication of nuclear devices and their delivery systems cause alarm, but their numbers do also. It is common to see figures regarding the destructive power of all nuclear weapons. In 1981, they were estimated to have the destructive power of ten tons of TNT for every human being on earth. (Ground Zero, 1982). In addition to their total destructive power, the sheer numbers increase the probability of accidental detonation.

A recently revealed concern has also received much publicity. Scientific theories regarding nuclear winter have been based on models which have been developed to study the effects of volcanic eruptions. Simply put, the theory states that the amount of dust raised from nuclear explosions coupled with smoke from city and forest
fires will encircle the earth, causing great light and climatic changes. The combination of cold, dark, and radioactivity from a 5,000-megaton (a relatively small) war is believed to be sufficient to threaten the entire human species, and possibly all life on earth (Turco, Toon, Ackerman, Pollack, & Sagan, 1983).

Social Factors

There are likely societal factors which have provided impetus for peace education. The relatively rapid change in many aspects of American life have set the stage and tone for the peace movement. Two such major shifts have resulted from the civil rights and feminist movements.

Martin Luther King, Jr. spoke of his interest in peace issues. During the Vietnam War, he noted that minority men were fighting and dying in very high proportions compared to the rest of the population. He saw that America was using funds for the war effort instead of using them to help poor people. These realizations were coupled with
his belief that social change should come through non-violent action. King criticized the racism, materialism, and militarism which he felt were prevalent in the United States. He cited western arrogance, and felt that a terrible fear of Communism, comfort, complacency, and an ability to adjust to injustice characterized America.

Comparable analogies have been drawn between militarism and sexism. Hoffman (1982) described militarism as an extreme form of sexism, which depends on sexism for its existence. Militaristic (aggressive and competitive) values were viewed by her as part of, and rationales for, a patriarchy. She noted that if both sexes were socialized more as women have been traditionally (i.e., stressing kindness, cooperation, nurturance, and respect for human feelings and differences), militarism could not exist. Thus, as women have gained some political clout, they have brought some of their traditional socialization to bear on policy-making. Similarly, Watson and Watson (1982) associated militarism with social handicaps.
Perhaps another social change could be added to this list, that of the changing role of the media. In the aftermath of the Vietnam War and Watergate hearings, journalists have been less reluctant to question authority and to expose leaders. In addition, there has been a noticeable increase in discussions and media programming dealing with nuclear issues, including dramas such as "The Day After", which attempted to depict life after a nuclear war. Widely viewed public television series have contributed to viewers' knowledge and awareness of nuclear issues. Examples are Dyer's "War", Sagan's "Cosmos", and "The Planet Earth." To a great extent, the latter two series could have imparted nuclear age information even to viewers who did not intend to seek it. Much of the last program of each series was devoted to speculation about planetary annihilation.
Educational Trends

It is typically believed that the public school systems of the U. S. have never been involved in nuclear age education. As adults who were of school age in the 1950s know, this has not always been the case. That generation participated in formal nuclear education in the form of civil defense training (Carey, 1982).

Drills were categorized into three types: (a) duck and cover drills, in which students dropped to the floor, preferably under their desks, and assumed a position described as the atomic head clutch position. This drill was intended to protect students in the event of a sudden attack without warning. They were to shield their heads and internal organs as much as possible by assuming this position, and by keeping their backs to the windows; (b) shelter drills, which were meant to prepare students for an attack when it was accompanied by sufficient warning. Students were to take cover in school hallways, basements, or other designated areas deemed strong enough to withstand a bomb blast; and
(c) dispersal drills, in which the warning was far enough in advance of the explosion to allow school children to get home safely. This last type was by far the least common, due to the lack of control, and the realization that any warning might not be sufficient to allow the children enough time to get home (Carey, 1982).

Curricular materials supplemented the drills. Comic books and films expressed a need to prepare for the duty of constant preparation to assure their country's survival (Carey, 1982).

There was some parental concern about the potentially unsettling effects of such materials and drills on their children. In answer to such concerns, parents were told that the materials had the qualities of cheerfulness and optimism. Persistent concerns about children's fearfulness were typically viewed as being unlikely in well-adjusted children. One principal argued that proper explanation of such activities would be sufficient to quell fears unless subversives were at work (Carey, 1982).
Fear of the effects of the hydrogen bomb was a source of concern for the Eisenhower Administration. At one time, it considered Operation Candor, which would have addressed the threat of nuclear war. The idea was dropped due to fears that the frankness would scare the public and be interpreted as weakness overseas. Instead, Operation Wheaties was adopted. It was a public relations effort to concentrate on the virtues of nuclear power while downplaying the threat of nuclear weapons (Carey, 1982).

The development of the hydrogen bomb caused a civil defense policy shift toward evacuation of cities. When this type of drill was practiced by the schools, however, it was found to be chaotic and cumbersome. In Mobile, Alabama's trial, 37,000 children were evacuated in 75 minutes, but there were 7,000 theoretical casualties. Some pupils were left behind. As the weapons grew larger and defensive preparation time grew shorter, the school civil defense program lost credibility. Schools were not able to design a suitable new model of civil defense, and so
"succumbed to the apathy toward the bomb typical of the rest of the country" (Carey, 1982, p. 124).

Recently, though, the new nuclear age education is becoming institutionalized in some areas of the United States. At the June, 1985 national Parent Teacher Association (PTA) convention, delegates adopted a resolution endorsing nuclear education. They also made a commitment to develop materials and programs to help parents cope with their children's nuclear fears (National Parent Teacher Association, 1985).

Winter (1986) documented the movement of many school districts and states toward nuclear age education. At the time of her writing, such programs were already in place in the following school districts: Cambridge, Massachusetts; San Francisco, California; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; New York City, New York; and Dade County, Florida. At the state level, nuclear age initiatives had been introduced into the legislatures of Connecticut, California, Maine, and Oregon, and the California initiative was
signed into law in 1984. In addition, Maine has established an Educational Clearing House on Nuclear Issues within its Department of Educational Services.

Psychological Research

The very recent field of psychological research into the effects of threat of nuclear war on children has been perhaps the main driving force in the peace education movement. Drew and Duensing (1985) alluded to youth attitudes in their rationale for beginning their "Vision of Peace" project. They felt a need to develop the program after finding that students were unable to express any visions of a peaceful future. Some statements of students which hinted at their sense of despair and powerlessness were noted by the researchers: "Why should I plan for the future? There's not going to be one;" "I'm going to school to get a good job and make a lot of money before it's all over;" "What can I do about war, hunger, pollution, and injustice? It's all in the hands
of the government." (Drew & Duensing, 1985, p. 32.)

Drew and Duensing questioned educators' abilities to prepare youth for the future if many of them feel there will be no future. This compels schools to formulate curricula to address feelings of hopelessness and powerlessness.

Beardslee and Mack (1983) found that little research had addressed the possible impact of the threat of nuclear war on children. Prior to 1978, only two studies had been done. These were conducted in the early 1960s, in response to the Berlin and Cuban missile crises. In the 1978 study, high school students responded to a questionnaire about their feelings about nuclear weapons. Some strong student responses were expressed. These were similar to the previously cited quotes: e.g., "I personally would not care to survive a nuclear attack"; "It has shown me how stupid some adults can be. If they know it could easily kill them I have no idea why they support it... the end of my life... may not be as far off as I would like it to be, or want" (Beardslee
They noted the intensity of the adolescents' responses was somewhat unexpected at that time.

Others have found that many student responses show a lack of hope for the future. Eighty-seven percent of 2,000 randomly selected students (from Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Oregon, and California) who took part in the 1982 Day of Dialogue thought there would be a nuclear war in the next 20 years and 90 percent felt the world would not survive. Eighty-one percent said the threat affected their hopes for the future, while 34 percent said it had an impact on their marriage and family plans (Snow, personal communication to Beardslee & Mack, 1983).

A questionnaire administered by Jon Klavens, a high school senior, found 34 percent of the students surveyed believed a nuclear war would occur in their lifetime, 14 percent felt it would not happen, and 52 percent were unsure. A majority (62 percent) felt that the threat of nuclear war was increasing (Beardslee & Mack, 1983).
An ongoing survey of adolescent attitudes toward the draft and military found an increase in the percentage of males who worried about the nuclear threat. The proportion raised from 7.2% in 1976 to 31.2% in 1982. The pattern followed in the converse of the question. In 1976, 19.9% of males never worried about the issue, while in 1982, only 4.6% never worried. Similar findings were reported for females (Beardslee and Mack, 1983).

Another investigation attempted to determine how worries about nuclear conflict compared to other societal worries such as the economy, employment, energy, and marriage. Nuclear conflict was ranked as the highest worry 24 out of 58 times, not a majority, but more than any other category. (Beardslee & Mack, 1983).

An in-depth interview of adolescents (aged 14-19), revealed their fears of nuclear war. Participanting were 17 girls and 14 boys, having a diversity of religious and socioeconomic backgrounds and of formal nuclear education. All 31 adolescents who were interviewed said that the
existence of nuclear weapons affected their lives on a daily basis. Some had planned to move away from large cities because they are more likely to be targeted. A few had decided not to have children, saying that the threat of nuclear war had forced them to live more in the present. The adolescents reported different ways of shutting out nuclear thoughts, and some claimed the threat was responsible for their excessive use of drugs. A few coped by taking political action (Beardslee & Mack, 1983). The authors were concerned by the adolescents' deep discouragement and their sense of lack of personal control.

**Controversy about, and problems with psychological research.**

Considering the controversial and political nature of this issue, it is no surprise that there is great disagreement about research findings. This ranges from speculation about the depth and breadth of children's and adolescent's feelings to charges of professional irresponsibility.

Some people believe that fears of nuclear war are mostly confined to children of affluent,
liberal parents who are themselves concerned about nuclear war. Effects of children's fears on children's daily lives has also been questioned (Butterfield, 1984).

In a much more vociferous condemnation of research findings, Adelson and Finn (1985) claimed that testimony about nuclear nightmares comes only from those whose parents are deeply engaged in the nuclear freeze movement. They charged psychologists and psychiatrists with becoming missionaries to a cause, and with exploiting children.

In fact, Beardslee and Mack acknowledged the shortcomings of related research. Among these problems are: non-systematic sampling procedures, questionnaire formats, lack of knowledge of the relative importance of this issue in comparison with other technological or social problems (Beardslee & Mack, 1983). Many of the studies they cited have an informal format which leads to questionable results. In spite of methodological flaws in individual studies, however, there seems to be general agreement among the findings.
Beardslee and Mack pointed to some important characteristics of the issue under study. They felt that no study has demonstrated diagnosable psychopathology as a direct result of the nuclear threat, but that child psychiatry and psychology lack models for understanding the impact of political and international events on children. The nature of the issue itself is abstract, but overwhelming in its horror and scale. The following confounding variables were cited by these authors as further obscuring the issue: rapid technological changes, familial and social changes, disillusionment with the political system, and economic woes. It is probably impossible to separate these factors in children's fears, or to try to establish a cause-effect relationship between or among any of them (Beardslee & Mack, 1983).

Perhaps the most disturbing element of related research is due to the nature of the topic itself. Dealing with the subject of nuclear annihilation is very painful for all of those involved, including children, parents,
researchers, and clinicians. It is disturbing for adults to think that the threat of nuclear war (and the presence of nuclear power plants) is possibly having a deleterious effect on children's development (Beardslee & Mack, 1983).

Given the relative recency of the psychological research into the effects of threat of nuclear war on children and adolescents, it is impossible to arrive at a consensus. Recent articles on the subject, however, point to a growing awareness of possible connections between the threat and children's and adolescents' behaviors.

Concerns about these potential psychological and behavioral effects are often explicitly stated as a rationale for the development of peace education curricula. The rapid growth in the development of such curricula testifies to the perceived urgency of the issue. While concern over the psychological effects of the nuclear threat is one of the driving forces behind the
peace education arm of the peace movement, it is one of the most controversial because of its newness and relative lack of basic research.
Factors Working Against Further Growth in Peace Education

There is widespread concern among people about the possibility of nuclear war, for the previously noted reasons, and undoubtedly many more. In spite of the huge growth in the peace movement and in peace education there are still many factors which work to stifle its growth. Following is an outline of often stated factors: (a) newness of the discipline; (b) traditional teaching regarding war and peace; (c) curricular materials; (d) political controversy; (e) polarization within the peace movement; and (f) lack of centralized organization.

Newness of the Discipline

One of the essential problems facing the peace education movement is that its newness has not allowed for adequate research into one of its most controversial claims—that there are negative effects of the threat on children, and
particularly on adolescents. People worry that nuclear education will increase, rather than diminish children's fears.

**Traditional Teaching Regarding War and Peace**

Berman (1982) spoke of a 30-year conspiracy of silence concerning nuclear weapons. She stated many reasons for this silence and the difficulty in breaking it: deference to experts; fear of Communism; the inability of people to comprehend the qualitative differences between conventional and nuclear weapons; inability to comprehend the destructive power of such weapons; and confidence that no one will be foolish enough to use nuclear weapons. Berman felt that the change in U.S. strategic defense plans (away from MAD and toward preparedness for limited nuclear war) did much to change some of these assumptions; it crumbled people's psychic security. Yet the silence prevailed until psychologists and educators began to realize that youth feared nuclear war in spite of adult attempts to protect them from such fears.
Berman spoke of four difficulties which teachers reported after a "Day of Dialogue" about the arms race: (a) Students lacked a conceptualization of peace; (b) Students had a strong image of the Soviets as the enemy and held prejudices based on little information; (c) Students expressed a strong feeling of powerlessness; they lacked inspiring models of individuals and organizations which can make a difference; and (d) Adolescents, who are typically thought to be naturally idealistic, expressed cynicism about the future.

Berman also noted a common complaint among peace activists which is a curricular issue. It is a hindrance to peace education which is rooted in tradition. United States history, as it has been taught in schools, has focused on wars and conflicts. The heroic and positive aspects of war have been stressed. The focus on wars carries the hidden message that "...war is a logical and natural outcome of disputes that could not be resolved by other means" (Berman, 1983, p. 503).
Generally peace is projected as a lull between wars, not as an active, on-going process.

Curricular Materials

Many authors have expressed concern about one reason for the previous silence about nuclear issues in the schools, textbooks. One author, Fleming (1983), reported on an analysis of 19 recent high school history textbooks (10 in American history and 9 in world history). All of the world history books mentioned the bombing of Hiroshima, and one omitted mention of Nagasaki. The most common treatment of the Hiroshima bombing was a few sentences comparing the force of the atomic bomb with that of previous bombs. Yet only three books mentioned effects of radiation. The cursory accounts of the effects of the bombing tended to support the conclusion of the 1981 Japan/United States Textbook Study Project:

The damages caused by the atomic bombs are not correctly stated. Overlooked in most United States textbooks are the number of
casualties, the fact that most of those killed were civilians, and the recognition that deaths from radiation sickness still occur among victims of the bombing (Fleming, 1983, p. 482).

In his study, Fleming noted that the above conclusions were also accurate for the texts he studied, with the exception of citing numbers of casualties. Only two of the texts made an attempt to focus on the horror of the two bombings. Most books gave some attention to Truman's moral dilemma, but nearly all of them found in favor of the former President.

Fleming found fault with the amount of coverage on the effects of the atomic bomb. Several devoted more space to the technological development of the bomb than to its effects; most books hinted at concerns about nuclear energy.

Only four texts dealt with the U.S.-Soviet arms race, and only two mentioned overkill or stockpiling. Nuclear deterrence and proliferation among other nations were mentioned in only a few
texts. One text even implied that treaties in the early 1970s ended the threat of nuclear war.

Fleming's analysis of American texts revealed slightly better coverage overall, although coverage of effects of the atomic bombs used was very similar to that in the world history texts. Somewhat more attention was given to Truman's decision to use the weapon. The accounts of bomb development focused less on scientific aspects, and more on the political and logistical problems. Fleming credited a few texts for their coverage of the moral dilemma experienced by scientists who were working on the Manhattan Project.

In American history texts, the coverage of deterrence and arms control was somewhat better. Some hinted at overkill and proliferation.

Fleming's conclusion, however, was that the textbooks typically gave scant attention to nuclear war and arms limitations. He offered three examples in world history books which showed the lack of coverage of such issues relative to others. One text devoted three pages to
impressionist and post-impressionist paintings and only one paragraph to the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings. Similarly, another book spent one page on the plight of Tasaday natives in the Philippines, but only one paragraph on Hiroshima. A third text gave as much space to creation of stained glass windows as to all nuclear war issues. The same trend existed in U. S. history books. One example noted eighteen pages devoted to the American Revolution versus one-half page to all aspects of nuclear war.

Given the widespread use of textbooks in social studies programs, it is obvious that their relative silence on nuclear issues detracts from more complete understanding of such issues for high school students. The clear implication is that if teachers do not supplement the textbooks, the students' understanding of nuclear issues will be very rudimentary. The controversial nature of the topic tends, however, to discourage the practice of supplementing texts. Additionally, Fleming noted another common occurrence which compounds problems in student understanding: the
fact that many teachers do not reach post-World War II issues in class due to lack of time at the end of the school year.

**Political Controversy**

A fairly common belief is that the peace movement is a fringe, liberal movement. Closer inspection reveals that the concern about nuclear weaponry cuts across all ideological lines. There is a feeling that if the nuclear issue is not resolved, nothing else matters; all other problems fade in comparison (Fleming, 1983). Still, for those outside the peace movement, this notion of ideology detracts from the movement's credibility. Paldy (1983) stated that people often react to nuclear education as a partisan issue rather than one of general concern. Wieseltier noted that people with otherwise very different political interests and ideas have recognized that the threat of nuclear annihilation bands the citizenry of the United States into a single community of fate (Wieseltier, 1983). Members of the peace
movement would expand his statement to include all inhabitants of the planet.

**Polarization Within the Peace Movement**

Scribner (1983) alluded to another inhibiting aspect of the peace education issue; the complexity of the related issues can lead to divisiveness and polarization within the movement. Fundamental disagreements arose at a national gathering about both the nature of failure of schools to address the issue, and of causes of the arms race. Debate about failure of schools depended upon different perceptions. Some view it as a failure to teach critical thinking skills; others as a failure to instill values; and still others as failure to impart sufficient knowledge. Theories about causes of the arms race varied widely. They ranged from emphases on institutional and technological causes, to questions of political and economic power, and to questions of personal political and moral responsibility. Scribner also felt that the complexity and interdisciplinary nature of nuclear
age education makes incorporating it into existing educational programs difficult.

**Lack of Centralized Organization**

Perhaps one of the greatest hindrances to the movement is the lack of centralized organization. While the large numbers of peace and peace education groups are impressive, they are evidence of a lack of centralization. This problem is indicated by the fact that attempts at comprehensive listings of peace organizations fail to include all groups engaged in the movement. Scribner characterized this growth as rapid but haphazard, and as occurring mostly through isolated initiatives (Scribner, 1983). He outlined some difficulties that accompany such an organizational problem. New efforts do not benefit from experience of other groups, and organizations begin to compete for financial support and constituencies. Also, there is no systematic provision for the exchange of information and resources.
In a related issue, Winter (1986) noted that the federal government has been noticeably silent about nuclear age education in the last three years. They conducted a pilot test of a school curriculum, "Emergency Management Instruction," in 1981-1982. It was criticized by educators and citizens. The government's original intention was to deploy the curriculum across the nation, but apparently the criticism altered these plans. Clearly, nuclear age education would be easier to effect if the federal government would take an active role.
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Unanswered Questions

The newness of the interdisciplinary approach to peace studies and related psychological studies probably leaves more questions unanswered than answered. Following are some questions which need to be addressed in order to enhance the credibility of the peace education movement:

1. Given the range of issues deemed important in peace education, is there a core of knowledge or a framework that should be a common thread in peace curricula? How would such a framework differ for various age/developmental levels?

2. How does a school work toward a consensus on the selection of a model for peace studies and security issues? Is it even realistic to expect any kind of consensus on such a controversial topic?

3. Now that curricula have been in use, can research be done to help determine whether these curricula have: (a) increased student understanding of current issues; (b) impacted
student attitudes; or (c) added to or detracted from the sense of helplessness that often accompanies thoughts of the possibility of nuclear warfare?

4. Beardslee and Mack (1983) called for more extensive studies of the effects of the threat of nuclear war on children. Among their methodological suggestions were: more systematically chosen, larger samples; use of quantitative measures; studying the impact of nuclear concerns in comparison to other youth concerns; and, in general, more research about how youth develop their attitudes about nuclear issues.

Summary and Conclusions

It is apparent from the current literature that peace education is beginning to take hold in the public schools of the United States. The breadth and depth of such educational programs are increasing.

It is interesting to note some other fairly recent educational trends which seem to closely
parallel peace education, and which have possibly set the groundwork for it. In fact, these trends are often viewed as components of peace education. Among these are: multicultural, non-sexist education; cooperative learning (peer and cross-age tutoring); a focus on social skills and affective education (including values education) in addition to academics; problem-solving skills; and critical thinking skills.

These aspects suggest a basic premise that forms the foundation of the peace education movement. It is alluded to in Representative Leach's comments about the shortcomings of "Star Wars" technology. It is the premise that the attempt to find technological solutions to political and social problems is futile. This is why the peace movement stresses global education and conflict resolution, and why education is seen as a crucial component by the larger peace movement.

A common thread explicitly stated in much of the literature, and implicit in most of it, is a sense of urgency. There is a feeling that much
time has been wasted; society is getting a late start on, but is finally waking up to, an issue which should have been addressed long ago. There is a feeling of being engaged in an attempt to beat the nuclear clock. This is graphically expressed by the editors of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists in the January, 1984 issue. They moved their doomsday clock forward to three minutes before midnight. It was noted that only once in their 39-year-old history had the minute hand been closer. That was in 1953 because of the development of the hydrogen bomb.

The reasons stated for the steady advances in the clock over the previous decade were: (a) designing of nuclear weapons for fighting rather than deterring war; (b) the militarization of thought and discourse; (c) a lack of positive forms of discourse between the superpowers; and (d) arms control negotiations having been reduced to propaganda ("Three minutes," 1984). While the editors counseled against despair, they stated that controlling nuclear weapons may be unlikely.
Since that time, the meeting of Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev served to reduce some previous international tensions. It appears, though, that the good will which occurred at their first meetings will not easily translate into meaningful arms limitation talks, and does not even guarantee future meetings.

Recent hostilities between the United States and Libya are likely to heighten fears and thus strengthen the peace and peace education movements, which are already gaining much ground. Similarly, worries over the recent nuclear power accident at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union are likely to add impetus to the peace movement.

In light of deteriorating international relations and other social problems, it is easy for many people to shun involvement in the peace movement, even though they may agree with the aims. There is a widespread feeling that nothing will help, and that the aims of cooperation espoused by the movement are unrealistic. Those who are involved, however, frequently counter such statements with examples of relatively rapid
social changes throughout history. Common examples cited are the virtual eradication of slavery, witchburning, and other previously common practices.

There is an abundance of information on peace and peace education groups which are operating across the nation. Most of the published information, however, has focused on larger cities; there seems to be no documentation of related efforts in smaller towns and rural areas. This author concludes that the movement is even much more widespread than the literature would suggest, and that it is definitely more than a passing fad.

The peace and peace education movements appear to be very broadly based, grassroots movements. The sense of urgency and the perception that education is a prerequisite to change guarantee that peace education will remain vital, even if controversial.
REFERENCES


Appendix

Following are technical terms which will more clearly explain some of the text of this study. All definitions are taken from the glossary of the Ground Zero book, *Nuclear war: What's in it for you?*, pp. 250-263 (1982).

**Antiballistic missile (ABM) system.**
Interceptor missiles, radar, and other equipment designed to intercept and destroy incoming ballistic missiles.

**Ballistic missile.** Missile with a rocket booster and payload, which travels in an archlike path. The term "ballistic" refers to gravity, which is the predominant force completing the flight path after the booster drops off, following the first 10-15 percent of the flight.

**Civil defense.** Plans for protection of the general population, leaders, and industry in case of nuclear attack. (In its broader sense, it includes plans for protection against natural disasters also.)
Cruise missile. A pilotless, guided missile which uses aerodynamic lift and propulsion to counteract gravity and drag, respectively. Its flight path remains within the earth's atmosphere, therefore making it less susceptible to radar tracking.

Deterrence. Related to mutual assured destruction. A strategy in which country's leaders are convinced that aggression is unattractive because potential losses and risk of escalation offset anticipated gains.

Fallout. Radioactive particles carried into the upper atmosphere by a nuclear explosion; these fall back to earth downwind, often in the form of rain.

First strike. A first, offensive move of a war, frequently used to refer to a major nuclear attack on enemy nuclear forces. Also called a preemptive strike.

Ground zero. The point (geographical coordinates) at which a nuclear weapon detonates; or the point on the earth's surface which is directly below such a detonation.
**Intercontinental ballistic missile (IBM).** A ballistic missile defined as having a range of 5,500 kilometers, therefore capable of reaching targets at intercontinental distances.

**Launch on warning.** Policy of launching ICBMs based on satellite and other warning system information which indicate an enemy missile attack.

**Mutual assured destruction (MAD).** A policy for avoiding nuclear war based on the ability of opposing sides to inflict heavy damage on enemy population centers, industry, military, and other resources even after having absorbed a first strike.

**Payload.** Weapons and penetration aids carried by a weapons delivery vehicle.

**Triad.** Combination of three types of bombers, each of which presents a different defensive problem to opposing forces. These three U.S. systems are: ICBMs, SLBMs (submarine launched ballistic missiles); and intercontinental bombers.
Verification. The process of determining whether other countries are complying with arms control agreements.